



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

90
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/033,030 | 11/09/2001 | Ted Gower | 1789.009 | 9991 |

21917 7590 07/03/2003

MCHALE & SLAVIN, P.A.
2855 PGA BLVD
PALM BEACH GARDENS, FL 33410

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

FITZGERALD, JOHN P

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3637

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/033,030 | GOWER, TED | |
| | Examiner John P Fitzgerald | Art Unit 3637 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 November 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>1</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The “butterfly pattern” of the “tape means” attached to the material which is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). It is unclear from the applicant’s disclosure as to exactly what constitutes a “butterfly pattern” of “tape means” since neither the disclosure or claims properly explain the application of a “tape means” with regards to the invention.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 states that the panel is spaced apart from the structure “a minimum deflection distance.” The “minimum deflection distance” is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Claim 13 states: “a maximum deflection of approximately 20% before failure and air

permeability of approximately 250cfm at a wind force of 1 inch Hg.” It is unclear how the “maximum deflection” is represented as a non-dimensional percentage value, since “deflection” is a dimensional value, typically having length units (eg. mm, cm, inches, feet, etc.). Furthermore, if a percentage value is to be claimed, it must be based upon a characteristic dimension of the “panel” that changes or alters in some manner, within a specific plane within which the characteristic dimension resides. For example, a relationship involving the ratio of the original, non-deflected characteristic length to the deflected characteristic length, or a strain value, wherein the change in the characteristic length is divided by the original, non-deflected length. Specifically regarding the “air permeability” of approximately 250cfm must be based on a pressure, not simply a force of 1 inch Hg. Further along this same line of reasoning, it is unclear if the pressure force of 1 inch Hg is considered to be “gauge pressure,” “absolute pressure,” “dynamic pressure,” or a combination thereof. Additionally, there are various methods of which a volumetric flow rate is calculated. It is typically based upon a characteristic area of material through which the flow rate is calculated. It is unclear what method and/or characteristic area value the applicant is applying in determining the air permeability of approximately 250cfm.

5. Claim 12 recites the limitation "said curtain means" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or

improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 10 of U. S. Patent No. 6,325,085 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: a kit or device for protecting a portion of a structure comprising a flexible material or textile with a fail/burst strength of 61.3 psi, which falls within the rage of 61.3 and 675 psi; the flexible material or textile having a mesh or interstice size being greater than 3/16 inches = 4.7625 mm, which falls within the range of 0.6 to 4.8 mm, the mesh or interstice size chosen to prevent passage of wind born objects of the corresponding size (3/16 inches); and edges having

means for securing the textile material corresponding to a peripheral hem “adapted to” secure the panel to the structure.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. As best understood, claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gitlin et al. and applicant’s disclosure. Gitlin et al. disclose a protective barrier device for protecting frangible portions of a structure from wind force and wind born objects (Figs. 1-10) (Gitlin et al: col. 2, lines 9-17) having at least one panel (22, 23, 24); a peripheral hem (26) “adapted to” secure the panel to the structure whereby the panel is spaced apart from the structure a minimum deflection distance to allow for deceleration of objects impacting the panel before the objects impact the frangible portions of the structure; wherein the panel is a flexible textile formed of synthetic threads of polypropylene or polyethylene resistant to ultra violet, biological and chemical degradation and further being porous to light in various percentages of transparency while simultaneously being porous to wind (Gitlin et al.: col. 3, lines

23-46); and wherein the peripheral hem has a plurality of releasable fasteners (69), some of the fasteners "adapted to" to attach to ground anchors (62) to secure the panel in the spaced apart relation to the structure. Applicant discloses that "current impact test of certain locales" requires a wood 2x4 stud to be shot at a protective barrier exerting a total force of approximately 230 pounds, or 61.3 pounds per square inch (psi) (page 10, lines 7-14). Applicant further discloses that building code regulations of Dade County, Fla. Require that the smallest diameter missile with which they are concerned is 3/8 inches = 9.525 mm (page 20, lines 20-23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the protective barrier device disclosed by Gitlin et al., by employing a flexible textile fabric having the claimed physical properties to meet or exceed current standards in testing and building code regulations required by particular locales. In specific regards to claims 6 and 7, it is considered well known in the art to provide various layers, coatings or films such a vinyl to textiles and fabrics to increase their resistance to moisture penetration as well as increase durability.

10. As best understood, claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gitlin et al. and applicant's disclosure, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nolte. Gitlin et al. and applicant's disclosure teach a protective barrier device having all of the elements stated previously. Gitlin et al. and applicant's disclosure do not expressly teach a protective barrier device wherein the barrier includes a plurality of panels, the panels having parallel edges "adapted to" be releasably connected, the edges having cooperating releasable fasteners spaced therealong; and wherein the spaced fastenings are set in from an edge of the curtain means "to cause" the edge to extend past inset fasteners to eliminate any gap that may otherwise exist between the edge and an attaching means; wherein the spaced fastenings are

Art Unit: 3637

reinforced by a tape means attached to the material in a butterfly pattern; and wherein the tape is polypropylene. Nolte teaches a protective barrier device (Figs. 1-14) for a structure having a plurality of web fabric panels (9) wherein the panels have parallel edges "adapted to" be releasably connected; the edges having cooperating releasable fasteners (18) spaced therealong, and wherein the spaced fastenings are set in from an edge of the panel "to cause" the edge to extend past inset fasteners to eliminate any gap that may otherwise exist between the edge and an attaching means; wherein edges are secured by a tape means (19) attached to the material in a butterfly pattern (Fig. 12). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a plurality of panels releasably connected to one another, as taught by Nolte, modifying the protective barrier device disclosed by Gitlin et al. and applicant's disclosure, thus providing for a modular system of individual panels that can be rapidly and readily attached to one another forming any desired shape (Nolte: col. 1, lines 22-29). In specific regards to claim 11, it would have been obvious matter of design choice to employ a "tape means" made of polypropylene, or a "tape means" made of any desired material, since applicant has not disclosed that a "tape means" made of polypropylene solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a "tape means" of any desired material.

11. As best understood, claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gitlin et al. and applicant's disclosure. Gitlin et al. disclose a protective barrier device for protecting frangible portions of a structure from wind force and wind born objects (Figs. 1-10) (Gitlin et al: col. 2, lines 9-17) having at least one panel (22, 23, 24); a peripheral hem (26) "adapted to" secure the panel to the structure whereby the panel is spaced

apart from the structure a minimum deflection distance to allow for deceleration of objects impacting the panel before the objects impact the frangible portions of the structure; wherein the panel is a flexible textile formed of synthetic threads of polypropylene or polyethylene being porous to light in various percentages of transparency while simultaneously being porous to wind due to variations in mesh size (Gitlin et al.: col. 3, lines 23-46); having upper and lower edges, the lower edge "adapted to" to attach to the ground in such a manner to secure the panel in the spaced apart relation to the structure. Applicant discloses that "current impact test of certain locales" requires a wood 2x4 stud to be shot at a protective barrier exerting a total force of approximately 230 pounds, or 61.3 pounds per square inch (psi) (page 10, lines 7-14). Applicant further discloses that building code regulations of Dade County, Fla. Require that the smallest diameter missile with which they are concerned is 3/8 inches = 9.525 mm (page 20, lines 20-23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the protective barrier device disclosed by Gitlin et al., by employing a flexible textile fabric having the claimed physical properties to meet or exceed current standards in testing and building code regulations required by particular locales. Furthermore, Gitlin et al. disclose that variations in the mesh size of the flexible textile fabric can be made to allow for variations in desired porosity of light and wind. These changes in mesh size, in turn, inherently vary the "physical" characteristics of the flexible textile fabric, thus achieving various values of "maximum deflection" percentages, such as 20% before failure, as well as variations of porosity of wind such as 250cfm at a wind force of 1 inch Hg. Additionally, it is well within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the mesh size or choose a particular flexible textile fabric having the desired mesh size, and thus, the inherent physical properties

associated therewith; to protect a building structure based on building code requirements of particular locales. In specific regards to method claims 14-16, the claims have not been given any patentable weight for they fail to further limit the article claim 13.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ballinger teaches a protective cover for a structure having panels and anchors; Sporta teaches a protective device for a structure having anchors and flexible material fabric; Schwartz teaches a protective device of flexible material fabric and Dischler teaches a projectile resistant material.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Fitzgerald whose telephone number is (703) 305-4851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai, can be reached on (703) 308-2486. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)-872-9302 before final action, and (703) 872-9327 after final action. Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-1113.

JF
JF

06/30/2003

LANNA MAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Lanna Mai